

2

REMARKS

In the Office Action, dated July 1, 2004, the Examiner states that Claims 1-4 are rejected and Claims 5-6 are objected to. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the Applicant's claim for foreign priority is acknowledged. The Examiner is hereby informed that no claim for foreign priority has been made, and thus this is the reason why certified copies of the counterpart Taiwanese application have not been provided.

In the Office Action claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b), and claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a). Claim 3 is rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph. However Claims 5 and 6 are indicated as being allowable subject matter.

The Applicant has amended Claim 1 to introduce the previous limitations of Claims 2 and 5, and has removed indefiniteness by this amendment in Claim 3. The remaining claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 are thus considered allowable.

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in better condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

September 9, 2004

Date

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613